through the grand jury testimony, when they challenge every inference that you should logically draw from the record, and then suggest that, oh, but we should not have anybody in here; so you who are going to judge ultimately whether our representations are persuasive or not about those inferences, whether you should be able to judge—and I think you should—what the witnesses actually are saying.

I will give you one illustration. I don't know how many times—two or three times—I put up here on the board, or I have said to you—and I know a couple of my colleagues said to you—that during the discussion with regard to the affidavit that Monica Lewinsky had in front of the grand jury, she explicitly said: No, the President didn't tell me to lie, but he didn't discourage me either. He didn't encourage me or discourage me.

You need to have her say that to you. They have even been whacking away at that, confusing everything they can, talking about the job searches at the same time they are talking about the affidavit, what she said here, there, or anywhere else. Witnesses are a logical thing. There are a lot of conflicts that are here.

When we get to the point—which we presume we will get that opportunity to do—to argue our case on why we should have witnesses, maybe Monday or perhaps Tuesday—I think that even though you have a motion to dismiss, we will get that chance—we will lay out a lot of these things. There are a lot of them out there. But the point is, overall, you need to have the witnesses to judge what any trier of fact judges about any one of these.

I would be happy to yield to Mr. GRAHAM or Mr. ROGAN if they wish—neither one. That is fair enough.

Mr. LOTT addressed the Chair.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The majority leader is recognized.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, it now approaches the hour that we had indicated we would conclude our work on Saturday. There may still be some questions that Senators would like to have offered. I have talked to Senator DASCHLE.

One suggestion made is that maybe on Monday we would ask that questions could be submitted for the RECORD in writing. I think that is a common practice. We don't want to cut it off. At this point, I would not be prepared to do that. But I would like to suggest that we go ahead and conclude our business today, and if there is a need by a Senator on either side to have another question, or two or three, we will certainly consult with each other and see how we can handle that, perhaps on Monday, and even see if it would be appropriate to prepare a motion with regard to being able to submit questions for the RECORD, which would be answered. We would not want to abuse that and cause that to be a protracted process.

In view of the time spent here—in fact, we have had around 106 questions, and we are about 10 hours into this now—I think we should conclude for this Saturday. We will resume at 1 p.m. on Monday and continue in accordance with the provisions of S. Res. 16. I will update all Members as to the specific schedule when it becomes clear.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that in the RECORD following today's proceedings there appear a period of morning business to accommodate bills and statements that have been submitted during the day by Senators. I thank my colleagues for their attentiveness during the proceedings.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 1 P.M. MONDAY, JANUARY 25, 1999

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, I ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

Mr. HARKIN. I object.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. Chief Justice, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. Chief Justice, I seek recognition.

The CHIEF JUSTICE. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon, at 3:55 p.m., the Senate, sitting as a Court of Impeachment, adjourned until Monday, January 25, 1999, at 1 p.m.

(The following statements were submitted at the desk during today's session:)

LEADER'S LECTURE SERIES

● Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in the past several months, through the Leader's Lecture Series, we have been honored to hear from some of America's most outstanding leaders. Speaking just down the hall in the stately Old Senate Chamber, these distinguished guests have shared recollections and observations of life in the Senate, in politics, in this great country. Their imparted wisdom allows us not only to add to the historical archive of this institution, but also to gain perspective on our own roles here. As sponsor of the series and a student of recent history, I am especially appreciative of their participation.

At the conclusion of each Congress, the Senate will publish the collected addresses of these respected speakers and make them available to the public. But their words should be recorded prior to that time. For this reason, Mr. President, I now request that the presentations of our most recent lectures—former President George Bush, who was here Wednesday night, and Senator ROBERT BYRD of West Virginia, who spoke in the fall—be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

REMARKS BY U.S. SENATOR ROBERT C. BYRD: THE SENATE'S HISTORIC ROLE IN TIMES OF CRISIS

Clio being my favorite muse, let me begin this evening with a look backward over the well traveled road of history. History always turns our faces backward, and this is as it should be, so that we might be better informed and prepared to exercise wisdom in dealing with future events.

''To be ignorant of what happened before you were born,'' admonished Cicero, ''is to remain always a child.''

So, for a little while, as we meet together in this hallowed place, let us turn our faces backward.

Look about you. We meet tonight in the Senate Chamber. Not the Chamber in which we do business each day, but the Old Senate Chamber where our predecessors wrote the laws before the Civil War. Here, in this room, Daniel Webster orated, Henry Clay forged compromises, and John C. Calhoun stood on principle. Here, Henry Foote of Mississippi pulled a pistol on Thomas Benton of Missouri. Senator Benton ripped open his coat, puffed out his chest, and shouted, ''Stand out of the way and let the assassin fire!'' Here the eccentric Virginia Senator John Randolph brought his hunting dogs into the Chamber, and the dashing Texas Senator, Sam Houston, sat at his desk whittling hearts for ladies in the gallery. Here, seated at his desk in the back row, Massachusetts Senator Charles Sumner was beaten violently over the head with a cane wielded by Representative Preston Brooks of South Carolina, who objected to Sumner's strongly abolitionist speeches and the vituperation that he had heaped upon Brooks' uncle, Senator Butler of South Carolina.

The Senate first met here in 1810, but, because our British cousins chose to set fire to the Capitol during the War of 1812, Congress was forced to move into the Patent Office Building in downtown Washington, and later into a building known as the Brick Capitol, located on the present site of the Supreme Court Building. Hence, it was December 1819 before Senators were able to return to this restored and elegant Chamber. They met here for 40 years, and it was during that exhilarating period that the Senate experienced its ''Golden Age.''

Here, in this room, the Senate tried to deal with the emotional and destructive issue of slavery by passing the Missouri Compromise of 1820. That act drew a line across the United States, and asserted that the peculiar institution of slavery should remain to the south of the line and not spread to the north. The Missouri Compromise also set the precedent that for every slave state admitted to the Union, a free state should be admitted as well, and vice versa. What this meant in practical political terms, was that the North and the South would be exactly equal in voting strength in the Senate, and that any settlement of the explosive issue of slavery would have to originate in the Senate. As a result, the nation's most talented and ambitious legislators began to leave the House of Representatives to take seats in the Senate. Here, they fought to hold the Union together through the omnibus compromise of 1850, only to overturn these efforts by passing the fateful Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854.

The Senators moved out of this room in 1859, on the eve of the Civil War. When they

marched in procession from this Chamber to the current Chamber, it marked the last time that leaders of the North and South would march together. The next year, the South seceded and Senators who had walked shoulder to shoulder here became military officers and political leaders of the Union and of the Confederacy.

This old Chamber that they left behind is not just a smaller version of the current Chamber. Here the center aisle divides the two parties, but there are an equal number of desks on either side, not because the two parties were evenly divided but because there was not room to move desks back and forth depending on the size of the majority, as we do today. That meant that some members of the majority party had to sit with members of the minority. It did not matter to them. The two desks in the front row on the center aisle were not reserved for the majority and minority leaders as they are now, because there were no party floor leaders. No Senator spoke for his party; every Senator spoke for himself. There were recognized leaders among the Senators, but only unofficially. Everyone knew, for example, that Henry Clay led the Whigs, but he would never claim that honor. Clay generally sat in the last row at the far end of the Chamber.

The Senate left this Chamber because it outgrew the space. When they first met here in 1810 there were 32 Senators. So many states were added over the next four decades that when they left in 1859, there were 64 Senators. Yet, while the Senate had increased in size, it was essentially the same institution that the Founders had created in the Constitution. Today, another century and four decades later, and having grown to 100 Senators, it is still essentially the same institution. The actors have changed; the issues have changed; but the Senate, which emerged from the Great Compromise of July 16, 1787, remains the great forum of the states.

This is so, largely, because as a nation, we were fortunate to have wise, cautious people draft and implement our Constitution. They were pragmatists rather than idealists. James Madison, particularly, had a shrewd view of human nature. He did not believe in man's perfectability. He assumed that those who achieved power would always try to amass more power and that political factions would always compete out of self-interest. In *The Federalist Papers*, Madison reasoned that ''in framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this: You must first enable the government to control the governed; and, in the next place, oblige it to control itself.'' Madison and other framers of the Constitution divided power so that no one person or branch of government could gain complete power. As Madison explained it: ''Ambition must be made to counteract ambition.''

However, ambition has not always counteracted ambition, as we saw in the enactment by Congress of the line item veto in 1996. Just as the Roman Senate ceded its power over the purse to the Roman dictators, Sulla and Caesar, and to the later emperors, thus surrendering its power to check tyranny, so did the American Congress, the Senate included. By passing the Line Item Veto Act the Congress surrendered its control over the purse, control which had been vested by the Constitution in the legislative branch.

This brings me to the first point that I would like to leave with you this evening. It is this: the legislative branch must be eternally vigilant over the powers and authorities vested in it by the Constitution. This is vitally important to the security of our constitutional system of checks and balances and separation of powers. George Washington, in his Farewell Address of September 17, 1796, emphasized the importance of such vigilance:

''It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. . . . The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern. . . . To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them.''

Each Member of this body must be ever mindful of the fundamental duty to uphold the institutional prerogatives of the Senate if we are to preserve the vital balance which Washington so eloquently endorsed.

During my 46 years in Congress, and particularly in more recent years, I have seen an inclination on the part of many legislators in both parties to regard a chief executive in a role more elevated than the framers of the Constitution intended. We, as legislators, have a responsibility to work with the chief executive, but it is intended to be a two-way street. The Framers did not envision the office of President as having the attributes of royalty. We must recognize the heavy burden that any President bears, and wherever and whenever we can, we must cooperate with the chief executive in the interest of all the people. But let us keep in mind Madison's admonition: ''Ambition must be made to counteract ambition.''

As Majority Leader in the Senate during the Carter years, I worked hard to help President Carter to enact his programs. But I publicly stated that I was not the ''President's man''; I was a Senate man. For example, in July 1977, I opposed President Carter's plan to sell the AWACS (Airborne Warning and Control System) to Iran. Iran was then a military ally of the United States, but I was troubled over the potential security risks involved and the possibility of compromising highly sophisticated technology in that volatile region. I was concerned that the sale ran contrary to our national interests in maintaining a stable military balance and limited arms proliferation in the Middle East. Both Houses of Congress had to vote disapproval resolutions to stop the sale. I enlisted the support of the Republican Minority Leader, Howard Baker. Senator Baker was someone who could rise above political party when he believed that the national interests required it, just as he did during the Panama Canal debate. The Carter Administration chose to withdraw the sale of AWACS temporarily. Shortly afterwards, the Iranian Revolution occurred and the Shah was deposed. Had the sale gone through as planned, those sophisticated aircraft would have fallen into the hands of an unfriendly government. As so often has happened in our history, individual courage and character again charted our course.

This brings me to my second point. On the great issues, the Senate has always been blessed with Senators who were able to rise above party, and consider first and foremost the national interest. There are worthy examples in Senate history.

When I came to the Senate in 1959, artists were at work painting five porthole portraits in the Senate reception room. The Senate had appointed a special Committee chaired by Senator John F. Kennedy to select the five most significant Senators in Senate history. This was no easy task, because there were many potential candidates. In setting the criteria, the Committee looked to Senators who had stood firm for principle, who had not blown with the prevailing political winds, and who had made personal sacrifices for the national good. They were not saints or perfect men. Daniel Webster's personal financial dealings left an eternal blot on his record; yet, he deserved to have his portrait in the Senate reception room, not simply as a great orator but as a man who sacrificed his own political standing by endorsing the compromise of 1850, which was deeply unpopular in his home state of Massachusetts, but which he realized was the best chance to hold the Union together.

In my almost 46 years in Congress, I have seen other courageous Senators. I have already referred to the courage demonstrated by former Senator Howard Baker during the Panama Canal debates. Without Senator Baker's support, the Panama Canal Treaties would never have been approved by the Senate. The killing of American servicemen in Panama would have gone on, but Senator Baker threw his shoulder behind the wheel and helped to construct what he and I referred to as leadership amendments, amendments which protected U.S. interests in that region, and we both worked shoulder to shoulder against great odds, as indicated by the polls. We did so because we believed, after careful study, that the Treaties were in the best interests of the United States.

Howard Baker knew what Mike Mansfield and all students of the Senate's institutional role know. Political polarization—too much emphasis on which side of the aisle one sits, is not now, and has never been, a good thing for the Senate. I am talking about politics when it becomes gamesmanship or when it becomes mean-spirited or when it becomes overly manipulative, simply to gain advantage. I am not talking about honestly held views or differing philosophical positions. Those things enrich our system. Americans have always loved a good debate. And that is what I believe they wish for now—more substantive and stimulating debate and less pure politics and imagery. But I well understand history and its ebb and flow, and I well know that we live in an age of imagery. It is simply my wish that, sometime soon, the rising tide of imagery and partisanship will begin to ebb rather than to flow quite so freely.

Washington, in his farewell address, warned us against the ''baneful effects of the spirit of party'' when he said:

''. . . in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent its bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.''

I believe that the American people are more than tired of partisan warfare. I believe they wish for less of it from the Congress, especially in the Senate, where more statesmanship and a longer view are still expected.

Declining participation in elections, and repeated public surveys which indicate weariness, distrust, and alienation within our system ought to serve as a harbinger to be ignored at our peril.

It must be a matter of concern to all of us that all too few Americans look to officeholders for inspiration in these troubled and turbulent times. How can we attract the talent needed to serve in public office in future years if elected officials continue to be held in such low esteem? I would very much like to see a rekindling of basic faith in our leaders, and a renewal of interest in politics and in public service. But the existence of inspiring leadership by public officials is fundamental to a shoring up of that faith.

In short, I think the American people are in desperate need of some old-fashioned heroes. Now, it seems, today's heroes, if we want to loosely use the term, are merely celebrities—rock stars who spout deplorable messages, or sports figures who amass fortunes advertising baggy clothes at exorbitant prices. Not much to look up to here, I say. Not much to build dreams on. Look hard at the content of our popular culture. There is really nothing much to inspire and uplift. And regrettably there also is not much to counter the empty commercialism which is so prevalent today. It has become the norm.

So where are we in all of this? What is our role? What part can we as Senators—authority figures, statesmen representing the people—play while we simultaneously endeavor to carry out our 200-year-old mandate, bequeathed to us by some of the most brilliant men of their age, or of any age before or since?

Well, we have our prescribed and our tangential duties, we can show up for roll call votes, carry out our committee assignments, issue the obligatory press releases, dutifully follow up on constituent requests, and answer our mail. All of these are necessary and to a greater or lesser degree important. But a reemphasis by the Senate on our strict institutional role is certainly something which I would like to see. It is a sobering and heavy responsibility all by itself, and its very weightiness tends to cool the over-heated passions of political demagoguery. After all, that role is, in a Constitutional sense, the reason we are here. The Framers expected a zealous defense of our powers to keep the tyrants at bay.

But there is still another role—an intangible something—that we who are privileged to sit in this body, and indeed leaders in the private sector, as well as those who write and reflect upon the news, are called upon to play. I call it the duty beyond our duties. The duty I am talking about is the duty to endeavor to inspire others and to demonstrate, through personal example, that public service of all types ought to be an honorable calling. Contrary to what many believe, it is absolutely the wrong place for the slick and the insincere.

Serving the public in a leadership role demands honesty, hard work, sacrifice, and dedication from those who dare to ask the people for such an awesome trust. Those who ask to shoulder that mantle also shoulder a much larger personal obligation than many of us may regularly contemplate. We all have a clear responsibility to serve as role models to inspire our people, and particularly our young people, to be and to do their best. On that score, we politicians, as a group, generally miss the mark. Perhaps it's because power, whether it be the power of political office, or the power to run giant corporations, or the power to report and analyze events, is a very heady thing. It can lead to arrogance, self aggrandizement, disregard for playing by the rules, and contempt for the people. It can lead us to forget that we are servants, not masters.

In the real world, exemplary personal conduct can sometimes achieve much more than any political agenda. Comity, courtesy, charitable treatment of even our political opposites, combined with a concerted effort to not just occupy our offices, but to bring honor to them, will do more to inspire our people and restore their faith in us, their leaders, than millions of dollars of 30-second spots or glitzy puff-pieces concocted by spin meisters.

These are troubling times for our nation and our people on both the national and international fronts. For our country to weather the rough seas ahead, we must use most tempered judgments and seek out our best and most noble instincts. Our example here can be a healing element—a balm to salve the trauma of distrust and disillusionment too long endured by a good people. Let each of us follow his or her own conscience when it comes to issues, but as we do so, may we be ever mindful of the sublimely uplifting part which the example of simple dignity, decency, decorum, and dedication to duty can play in the life of a nation.

Let us also remember that even after two hundred years, the Senate is still the anchor of the Republic, the morning and evening star in the American constitutional constellation. It has had its giants and its little men, its Websters and its Bilbos, its Calhouns and its McCarthys. It has been the stage of high drama, of comedy and of tragedy, and its players have been the great and the near great, those who think they are great, and those who will never be great. It has weathered the storms of adversity, withstood the barbs of cynics and the attacks of critics, and provided stability and strength to the nation during periods of civil strife and uncertainty, panics and depressions. In war and in peace, it has been the sure refuge and protector of the rights of the states and of a political minority because great and courageous Senators have always been there to stay the course and keep the faith. As long as we are ever blessed in this august body with those who hear the clear tones of the bell of duty, the Senate will continue to stand—the great forum of constitutional American liberty!

REMARKS BY PRESIDENT GEORGE BUSH

Senator Lott, Senator Daschle, Senators Thurmond and Byrd, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

What a special pleasure it is to look around this room and see so many respected former colleagues—and friends. As a former member of the extended Senate family, tonight has a certain homecoming feel to it. It's nice to be back.

It is particularly an honor to follow in the footsteps of the distinguished leaders who preceded me as lecturers for this series. Mike Mansfield, Howard Baker, and Robert Byrd are true giants in the Senate's history—each, in his own way, ''a Senator's Senator.'' In this room, it doesn't get any better than that.

It being apparent that a quorum is present, I feel it only proper to establish a single ground rule. I am ill suited to ''lecture'' anyone here about the Senate. As the resident expert on ancient Greek history, not to mention the Senate itself, Senator Byrd can tell you what happened to Socrates. Socrates was the great philosopher who used to go around lecturing everybody . . . until they poisoned him.

So to be clear, this is not a lecture. *Nor* is it a filibuster.

Speaking of filibusters, Barbara is sorry she couldn't be here this evening.

Yesterday, we were in Austin to see our son, George W., sworn in for his second term as Texas Governor. And two weeks ago, we were in Tallahassee to see our other politically-active son, Jeb, sworn in as Governor of Florida.

Today, the boys are sworn in . . . and their parents are worn out.

(My politics today relate to our two sons. I think this is my first visit to the Senate since leaving Washington on January 20, 1993—six years ago today.)

Of course, 18 years ago today, Barbara and I were participating in another inauguration—one that brought us back to Washington, and back to Capitol Hill.

It's funny, I ran for the Senate twice—both times with a spectacular lack of success. But for eight years, and then four more after that, all the Senators called me ''Mr. President.''

When I reported to the Senate in 1981, without a doubt the biggest influence made on me in terms of the Senate came from my father's 11 years of service here. My Dad loved the Senate. He had come out of a business background, and had done his civic duty serving as Town Moderator of Greenwich, Connecticut.

He respected his fellow Senators. He found the Senate a civil place to be. The term ''gentleman,'' he felt, applied far more often than not—just as term ''gentle lady'' applied to Margaret Chase Smith of Maine and other distinguished women who have called the Senate home.

My Dad and LBJ could be cross-threaded, as we say in the oil business, often disagreeing on issues. But on more than one occasion he told me he respected LBJ's leadership. I'll never forget it. He said: ''Lyndon's word was good. If he said a vote would be at a certain time, you could bet your bottom dollar that that was what would happen.'' Dad felt that LBJ as leader was fair to the minority and ran a tight ship.

Like my Dad, my predecessor in the Vice Presidency and the White House, Harry Truman, loved the Senate. Truman called the 10 years he spent here in the Senate the ''happiest of his life''—and I have to say I enjoyed my eight years here, too.

In letters written to his beloved wife, Bess, then-Senator Truman confided it took a while to learn the ropes. Along the way, one valuable piece of advice he received came from Ham Lewis of Illinois, the second-longest serving Democratic Whip. Said Lewis to the Missouri freshman: ''For the first six months you'll wonder how you got here. After that, you'll wonder how the rest of us got here.''

Later, Truman would write: ''I soon found that, among my 95 colleagues, the real business of the Senate was carried on by unassuming and conscientious men—not by those who managed to get the most publicity.'' Clearly, this was before the days of C–SPAN.

As for me, I loved interacting with Senators from both parties. Of course, it was easier for me, better, as Vice President. For one thing, with Howard Baker at the helm, my Party controlled the Senate for my first six years here—that helped. But after I moved down the street to the White House, my dealings with the Senate seemed to involve more raw politics.

As President of the Senate, the primary constitutional role I served was breaking tie

votes. I cast seven tie-breaking votes as VP—three times alone on the esoteric matter of nerve gas. (Most unpopular, those tie-breakers were.)

A myth arose from one of those votes that my mother bawled me out. Well, she didn't quite do that. She did give advice, however. After attending my first State of the Union speech as Vice President, for example, Mother called to say she had noticed that I was talking to Tip O'Neill while President Reagan was addressing the country. ''He started it,'' was all I could think to say.

''Another thing,'' she continued. ''You should try smiling more.''

''But Mum, the President was talking about nuclear annihilation.''

Everyone belittles the job of Vice President. The saying goes that the daily duties of the Vice President include presiding over the Senate and checking the health of the President. Theodore Roosevelt derided it as a ''stepping stone to oblivion.'' FDR's first VP, ''Cactus'' Jack Garner, said the vice presidency ''wasn't worth a warm pitcher of spit''—lovely thought, that.

(Historian Arthur Schlesinger, Jr. went so far as to suggest abolishing the office altogether, but then old Sam Rayburn would be quick to note that Arthur had ''never run for sheriff'' himself.)

When asked his thoughts on the Vice Presidency, LBJ, who was Majority Leader at the time, said: ''I wouldn't want to trade a vote for a gavel, and I certainly wouldn't want to trade the active position of leadership of the greatest deliberative body in the world for the part-time job of presiding.''

In fact, LBJ wielded so much power as Majority Leader that, when John Kennedy introduced him at a 1959 Boston dinner, he observed that: ''Some people say our speaker might be President in 1960, but, frankly, I don't see why he should take the demotion.''

A year later, Kennedy became only the second Senator to be elected President directly from the Senate—and as we now know, LBJ traded his vote for the gavel. Explaining his acquiescence to accepting the Number Two spot on the ticket, he said: ''I felt that it offered opportunities that I had really never had before in either . . . the House or the Senate.''

The truth is: Many pundits and press people ridicule the Vice Presidency to this day, but most Members of Congress would readily take the job. As Presidents delegate more responsibilities to their VPs, the job has become more productive. And, TR's critique notwithstanding, it has proven to be a fairly good stepping stone to the Presidency—or at least the Party nomination.

Just as LBJ became a revered role model for students of the Senate, I also learned from his example when I became President.

In his memoirs, LBJ stated he was ''determined, from the time I became President, to seek the fullest support of Congress for any major action that I took.'' I shared his desire to achieve consensus where possible.

When I raised my right hand and took the Oath of Office 10 years ago today, I meant it when I held out my hand and pledged to work with the leadership here on Capitol Hill. And despite the ugliness that erupted early on over the Tower nomination—and later over the nomination of Justice Thomas—I was generally pleased with much of what we accomplished during the first two years. Both the Clean Air Acts and the ADA were landmark pieces of legislation that became a reality only after the White House and the Senate demonstrated bipartisanship and compromise.

Of course, every so often, an issue would trigger the tensions built into Mr. Madison's system of checks and balance. When it did, progress necessarily became more difficult to achieve. The irony is: Many observers would look at this so-called ''gridlock'' and think the system was broken—when it was actually performing its ''salutary check on the government,'' just as the Framers intended.

Then came the Fall of 1990, when two major issues came to the fore: The budget, and the Gulf crisis. From the beginning, I wanted bipartisanship on both issues—and consensus. But I soon found out that consensus, on either matter, would not be easy to achieve.

For example, there was a fundamental difference of opinion between the Senate and the White House over the Senate's role in declaring war—one that dated back to the War Powers Act. Like all of my predecessors, I believe the War Powers Act to be unconstitutional; but as President, I still felt an obligation to consult fully with the Senate. In my mind, not agreeing with the War Powers Act did not mean ''failure to consult.''

And during the course of the Gulf crisis, I consulted with the Congressional leadership and bipartisan groups on more than 20 occasions—not including individual meetings and phone calls. I always remembered how LBJ had gone the extra mile to work with Congress at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1964. As he candidly confided that August 4th, during a meeting with nine Senators (led by Mike Mansfield) and seven House leaders in the Cabinet Room, he said he didn't want to ''go in unless Congress goes in with me.'' The resolution subsequently passed the House unanimously—416 to none. In the Senate, the tally was 88 to 2 in favor.

(Incidentally, LBJ thought Truman had made a mistake not asking for a resolution of support from Congress when he went into Korea. It wasn't until the Formosa Straits crisis erupted early in 1955 that a President would reach out to Congress in such a fashion. On January 24, 1955, the House took but an hour to consider President Eisenhower's message requesting a resolution before it passed 410 to 3. Four days later, the Senate followed suit by an 83 to 3 margin.)

If I had to pick one vote, I'd say the Senate vote in January 1991 on the resolution authorizing me to use ''any means necessary'' in order to liberate Kuwait was the key Senate vote during my Presidency. To be honest, for weeks we debated whether to try and pass such a resolution in the Senate. I'm glad we did bring it here, and pleased that it passed. But the 52–47 margin was the slimmest Senate margin ever to vote for war, and naturally I regret that we couldn't convince more in the Majority to help us send a clear and united signal to Saddam, and the world, about our resolve to lead.

Before the resolution passed, my respected friend, Sen. Inouye came to me and warned that ''if things go wrong (on the use of force), you could well be impeached.'' I'll never forget that. As it was, several House members had already filed papers of impeachment.

But we stayed the course, and I hope history will say not only that we won—but that we won with honor. And when our troops came home, this time they were welcomed with cheers—not jeers. It was a united country that saluted our troops, united by a new respect for our military and for U,S. world leadership.

Prior to the commencement of Desert Storm, we honored Congress' right to be heard, and to cast their votes, before a single shot was fired. In ending the war when we did, after Kuwait had been liberated, we also kept our word to our coalition partners—and abided by the international authority under which we agreed to operate. Our principled leadership and restraint enhanced our credibility in the region, and earned us a windfall of political capital—which we, in turn, used to jump-start the peace process.

As President, it fell to me to lead this effort; but let me note for the record that no President was ever more blessed by a superb team. ''Excellence'' best describes the people I had at my side.

I also want to note the special role played by one of your future speakers in this outstanding series, Bob Dole. It is well-known that Bob and I went head-to-head a time or two on the campaign trail—but when the dust of political combat settled, we were always able to put it behind us, and close ranks. It's a good thing, too, for during my four years as President, I earned the distinction as only the second Chief Executive to serve a full term without Party control in either House of Congress. As a result, I came to rely heavily on Bob Dole—and not once did he let me down.

He was the model Party leader in the Senate—never putting his agenda ahead of the President's. In my opinion, you could write a textbook based on the way he handled a tough job. Through it all, he showed great class, and courage, and leadership.

In the final analysis, I had my chance to serve, and did my best. I messed some things up, and maybe got a few things right. For four years, I was up against a Senate Majority that looked very differently at some of the key issues I faced as President, but I never felt that it wasn't within their right. That's just the way it was, and I am quite content to step aside and let history judge the merits of our actions.

Now, since leaving Office, I have stayed away from Washington—but that does not mean I lack interest in events here. I have refrained from commenting on the serious matter now before the Senate—and will continue to do so. But like Howard Baker and many others, I confess that the lack of civility in our political debate and official dealings with one another concerns me.

I worry, too, about sleaze—about excessive intrusion into private lives. I worry about once-great news organizations reduced to tabloid journalism—giving us sensationalism at best, smut at worst. (I have to be careful: I used to go around bashing the media, to standing ovations I might add, until a friend wrote and told me to stop it. So I joined Press Bashers Anonymous . . . and I've been clean for six months now.) But I do think the press needs to be more accountable.

All in all, it seems to me that, whereas the problems looming over this town dealt more with budget deficits in times past, today we are confronted with a deficit of decency—one that deepens by the day. Washington is a place for big ideas, and doing big things; but it's also a small town in many respects, too small for the bitter rancor that has divided us as people in recent times.

Having said that, as a former President, I don't believe in placing outside pressure on the Senate. I have felt it is better for the Senate to chart its own course and do its business without my intervention.

It is a popular notion, in some quarters, to name former Presidents as ''senators-for-life.'' After seeing what has happened to General Pinochet, I'd rather pass on that. I am not one who feels that former residents

of 1600 Pennsylvania must be consulted, or that some office must be created to use their expertise.

Writing in his book *Mr. Citizen* after he left Office, President Truman suggested designating former Presidents as ''Free'' members of Congress—with the right to sit in the Congress, take part in the debate, and sit in on any committee meetings, *but* with no right to vote. (This from a dangerously titled chapter, ''What to do with Former Presidents?'') I have great respect for President Truman, but no interest in such a concept.

Besides, should I speak up on a hot or controversial issue, some enterprising reporter would go to one of my sons and say: ''Your nutty father feels this way, Governor. How do you feel?''

They don't need that grief—nor do I.

It was Thomas Jefferson who said: ''There is a fullness of time when men should go, and not occupy too long the high ground to which others have the right to advance.''

So it is for the Bush family, just as it is here in the Senate family.

In his 1963 book, ''A Senate Diary,'' journalist Allen Drury published the daily diary he kept from 1943 to 1945 when he was a newly assigned reporter covering Capitol Hill. It's an extraordinary book that recorded his initial impressions, and captured the essence of the daily proceedings—particularly in the Senate.

Of the Senators themselves, Drury summarized: ''You will find them very human, and you can thank God they are. You will find that they consume a lot of time arguing, and you can thank God they do. You will find that the way they do things is occasionally brilliant but slow and uncertain, and you can thank God that it is . . . That is their greatness and their strength; that is what makes (the Senate) the most powerful guarantor of human liberties free men have devised.''

One last thought about the Senate.

Fifty years ago, I was starting out in the oil business—out on the dusty expanse of West Texas. In those days, in that place, a man's word was his bond. So much so, in fact, that much of our business was done on a handshake.

There aren't many places where you can still do business on a handshake. But you can still do it in the United States Senate.

Indeed, gathered as we are in this solemn setting, we not only marvel at how the universe outside these hallowed walls has changed over the last 189 years—we also take comfort at how much the world inside these walls has remained the same—how a timeless code of duty and honor has endured. And we can thank Almighty God that it has.

In this light, it is fitting to close with the words Aaron Burr used to close his career in the Senate. In his retirement address of 1805, Burr eloquently noted: ''It is here, in this exalted refuge; here, if anywhere, will resistance be made to the storms of political frenzy and the silent arts of corruption . . .''

As long as there exists a Senate, there will exist a place of constancy, of Madisonian firmness—a place unlike any other, where the sacred principles of freedom and justice are eternally safeguarded. As with this majestic chamber, may we always be humbled before it—and cherish it ever more.

Thank you very much.●

RETIREMENT OF THOMAS G. PELLIKAAN

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, Thursday, January 21 marked the end of Thomas Pellikaan's Senate career.

Over the past 35 years, Tom Pellikaan served the Senate with distinction in various capacities—first as Senate press liaison and then at the Office of the Daily Digest, where he spent the majority of his Capitol Hill career. He advanced from a staff assistant in the Daily Digest office to serve as Editor of the Daily Digest since 1989.

Tom's attention to detail is well known around the Halls of the Senate. His office has the responsibility of ensuring that the information contained in the Daily Digest section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reflects the actions taken on any given day in the Senate. The Daily Digest is an important and useful tool for the Senate family. Tom and his staff are to be complimented for the excellent job they have done and will continue to do.

While Tom has left the Senate, I am sure his interest in the Senate will continue. On behalf of my Democratic colleagues, we wish him well as he enjoys the ''country life'' on his farm in Culpeper, VA.●